

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067
Australia
Mob: 61+401692057
Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org
Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online
ISSN 1440-9828



December 2012 No 665

Kangaroo Court of Australia

*

The Julia Gillard, Ian Cambridge and Shane Dowling connection.



I first met Ian Cambridge in 2005. The same Ian Cambridge who called for a Royal Commission into the Julia Gillard / Bruce Wilson / AWU fraud in 1996.

He was a Commissioner of the NSW Industrial Relations Commission and I had just been sacked for warning people about a health and safety danger.

Ian Cambridge took a bribe in 1996 to cover-up the AWU fraud. His bribe was being appointed to the NSW Industrial Relations Commission which the then NSW Premier Bob Carr facilitated.

In 2005/2006 when I met him he was back up to his old tricks and covering up corruption for the benefit of the Labor Party and the evidence and documents are very clear cut in proving this.

There was no disputing there was a health and safety danger so much so that during the course of the proceedings Commissioner Ian Cambridge issued interim orders against the company, Cardcall a division of Telecorp, in the interest of public health and safety. This is unheard of. But there was a major problem, NSW WorkCover had been trying to cover-up the health and safety danger.

The court orders were breached with the help of NSW WorkCover as the documents show. There was no justification for the court orders being breached and Ian Cambridge knew it and he ultimately did the hatchet job on the case to cover-up the corruption at WorkCover.

All the evidence pointed to WorkCover employees taking bribes. Why would the company bribe them? As it turns out the company did not have Workers

Compensation Insurance and were in a lot of trouble. In 2005 numerous WorkCover staff were already under investigation by the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) for taking bribes and from my experience it was a lot more widely spread than that. ([Click here to read more](#))

It was not until a few years later that I realised fully why Cambridge had done the hatchet job on my case. The Labor Party could not have corruption at WorkCover exposed as they were busy stealing money from it. This is the same WorkCover that John Della Bosca and the NSW Labor Party stole \$660,905 from over a six year period and funnelled through the Transport Workers Union back into Labor Party bank accounts. ([Click here to read my previous post](#))

The reason Cambridge had to issue the interim orders during the proceedings is because evidence showed there was a health and safety danger. The same evidence that the Cardcall and NSW WorkCover had been sitting on for over 3 months but had failed to act. This post is the first of two or three posts on this. Some of the documents are just jaw dropping and the corruption at NSW WorkCover blatant.

Background

In 2005 I worked for a company called Cardcall which was a division of Telecorp. My role was mainly distributing point of sale material to shops for the sale of international calling cards. Plastic flags for outside shops were one of the items that I distributed. Initially they were fine. But then they got a new batch which had strong fumes coming from them.

I complained to management as had others but they did nothing. One day I left my car in the sun and when I came back it stunk of fumes. After more complaints I decided to get the flags tested. The person where I went to get them tested said to save my money as he knew what the chemicals were in the fumes and he gave me the Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) which tell people how they should handle the chemicals from a safety view-point.

I sent the MSDS sheets to the company and still they refused to act and warn staff. I then had a lawyer send a letter to the company on the 20th April 2005. ([Click](#)

[here to see the letter](#)) The company's response on the 28th April was they admitted that fumes were coming from the flags and that I did not have to distribute them anymore. But other staff did and they did no more than that. They were still sending the flags directly to customers as well. ([Click here to read their response](#))

I decided to go back to the testing place and get the flags tested so there was no doubt. Initially when I went to get the flags tested the guy was very casual about it and he gave me the MSDS sheets and said to save my money and not test them. When he did test them I spoke to him on the phone and his attitude had changed. He said he could not believe the figures coming from the tests so he had them tested twice. ([Click here for the laboratory report](#)) I asked him how safe they were to carry around in cars. Even though he is an expert in that area you need a certain qualification to give companies advice which he did not have, his role is the actual testing. But he said "put it this way I would not like to be driving around with them in my car." His attitude and tone had changed from one of being casual about the situation to hey there is a major problem and health hazard.

I sent to report to Cardcall. Their response was once again nothing. What came out in evidence, in an email, during the hearing is that they did send the lab report to Ross Hansen Senior Workplace Health and Safety Consultant at Commerce Queensland. They also had the flags tested but in an outdoor environment to simulate erecting a flag outside a shop knowing full well the amount of fumes would be greatly lower than fumes coming off flags stored in a car or an enclosed environment. For example people in head office who looked after point of sale material had also complained. His advice was "Gotalk Operations should instruct all sales executives transporting these flags to ensure they are transported in air-tight containers" (Gotalk was part of Telecorp) and "As these solvents are flammable, it would be appropriate for Gotalk Operations to enforce a **"no smoking in vehicles" policy, to reduce the risk of vapour ignition.**" and "While there is no denying that some adverse effects are being experienced by your sales executives" and "I question the figure in your sales executive's email to all staff of 1530mg/square metre i.e. 1.5g of solvent per square metre of flag. I would expect the flags to be extremely slimy with that level of solvent. 1530 micrograms per square metre may be more believable. If, on the other hand, the data are correct and the flags are slimy with these solvents, then an appropriate action might be to cease distribution of these flags forthwith and advise your sales executives and your clients to only handle these with rubber gloves (cyclohexanone will dissolve many of the commonly available plastic gloves) and/or to wash hands thoroughly after handling." ([Click here to read Ross Hansen's full email](#))

Now remember the person who did the testing questioned the results so he had them tested again so for Ross Hansen to question the results is no surprise. I have no doubt they were accurate.

So what did Steve Picton and Cardcall do on the above advice? Nothing! I ultimately sent an email to numerous staff and customers warning them about the dangers and was sacked.

The Termination

The termination letter which is dated the 16th May 2005 and was sent to my lawyer says that I warned that if I make "any further comment to retailers employees regarding health risks posed by the flags" that I would my employment terminated. It was quite a mind-blowing admission by the company. It was from the lawyer Jonathon Hassett who hopped in the witness stand and tried to back pedal from it. ([Click here to read the full termination letter](#)) When I went to court I represented myself for cost reasons.

First Hearing Day

18th of August 2005 – This was the first hearing date. The four people who gave evidence that day were 1. William Gore from the Queensland Health Scientific Services who did the dodgy test for Cardcall. After cross examination his evidence actually supported me. Hence the interim orders by Cambridge 2. Myself 3. Sally Garner who was the OH&S officer for the company 4. Steve Picton who was the CEO of the company. Transcript – 18th August 2005 ([Click here to read](#))

Interim Orders

25th August 2005 – I got a phone call a day or two before from Commissioner Cambridge's associate saying that I had to come to court as Cambridge was going to issue interim orders. I could feel the stress in her voice and she would not tell what the orders were for.

I went home and Googled Interim Orders as I did not know what it meant. When I found out I thought maybe he was going give me some back pay as the evidence that came out the first day was just so mind-blowing in my favour.

When I got to court Cambridge's associate knocked on the door as is customary and Cambridge stormed into the room. He sat down and said in the matter of Dowling v Cardcall *"The Commission issues this Statement and Interim Orders in the interests of the health and safety of employees and customers of the respondent employer"* and stormed out. I looked up at his associate and said "what just happened? I do not understand." She said read this it explains it and she gave me a copy of the interim orders. ([Click here to read](#))

The key parts in the orders are: *"During the presentation of evidence on 18 August, an issue arose regarding the alleged contamination of plastic promotional flags used by CardCall."* and sections:

4. The applicant complained about the odour that was emitted from the plastic flags particularly if the flags were stored in a confined space under raised air temperature, for example a motor vehicle parked in the sun. Some scientific tests were conducted on the plastic flags and evidence in this matter included certain test results.

5. In brief, the test results appear to indicate the presence of elevated levels of two particular solvents, Cyclohexanone and Isophorone. These solvents are toxic and can be harmful depending upon the concentration to which a person is exposed.

11. It was therefore disconcerting to discover during evidence provided on 18 August from CardCall managers, that no advice had been issued to CardCall employees and/or customers about the potential hazards that may be presented by elevated concentrations of solvents in the plastic promotional flags. At very least, in such circumstances, an employer should have provided its employees with information about the issue of elevated concentrations of solvents in the flags and implemented further investigation into the safe handling protocol for flags that have elevated concentrations of solvents such as Cyclohexanone and Isophorone.

The two orders that were issued were that Cardcall take the following action:

(a) notification to Workcover New South Wales with formal documentary request for assistance in further scientific testing of plastic promotional flags aimed at establishing appropriate safe handling protocols, and,

(b) written communication to all employees and customers who may be likely to handle plastic promotional flags advising of concerns regarding elevated concentrations of solvents in plastic promotional flags and suggesting that until conclusive safe handling protocols are established care should be exercised with the handling of the flags. In particular, the care that should be exercised with handling the flags may include the use of protective rubber gloves and/or thorough washing of hands after contact. Additionally, all persons handling the flags should avoid inhalation of fumes emitted from the flags and generally flags should only be handled in well ventilated situations.

The court case should have been won then and there. They admitted they had sacked me for warning people about a health and safety danger and there was one. My initial complaint had been made on the 12th May 2005 ([Click here to read](#))

The reason Cambridge had to issue the orders is because the company and WorkCover had failed to act. WorkCover had been in receipt of the material before I was sacked but had done nothing.

As per the court orders Cardcall wrote to WorkCover CEO Jon Blackwell to have the flags tested. ([Click here to read](#))

Elissa McGregor at WorkCover to inspector Belinda McKean asking her what the current situation was. Belinda McKean was meant to be investigating my complaint but was as sneaky as they come. ([Click here to read](#))

Belinda McKean wrote back to Elissa McGregor telling e few lies and deliberately concealing information. She said that I had not made a formal complaint in relation to being sacked. This was a straight out lie. She makes no mention in the letter that CardCall had not had Workers compensation for 5 to 6 years and were only fined \$750. She makes no mention of the Laboratory report that I gave WorkCover. And then Ms McKean advises they should not bother testing the flags because Cardcall say they are not going to distribute them any more. What Ms McKean is a lawyer is she. All WorkCover inspectors would be fully aware that the flags should have been tested not just for current injuries but also potential future injuries. ([Click here to read](#))

John Watson from WorkCover wrote to Cardcall in effect saying don't worry about the court order. Just ignore it. The letter mentions the test that Cardcall had done at Queensland Health Scientific Services and says that WorkCover was not able to establish that there was a health risk to employees.

The letter makes no mention of the test results which were from the commercial laboratory Packaging Inks (Aust) Pty Ltd which I provided to WorkCover. The same test results that forced Cambridge to issue interim orders. The same test results that are mentioned in the interim orders which WorkCover had a copy of. So why did John Watson ignore it?

The letter also makes no mention of Cardcall not having workers compensation insurance and having only been fined \$750. The numbers I crunched said they could have been fined up to \$250,000 for not having the workers comp for the last 5 to 6 years.

If it is a court order it is a court order

If a court issues an order that is it. You do what it says no if buts or maybes. The only person who can override that order is another judicial officer in court. John Watson, Jon Blackwell, Belinda McKean and the others would have been fully aware of this. The court order was in effect against WorkCover as well as they were mentioned in it. WorkCover have a large internal legal department so they knew.

But even if there was no court order they had an obligation to test the flags not just for current injuries but potential future injuries. When I was at the Telecorp head office one of the people in the stock room said words to the effect "this could be another James Hardie case in 10 to 20 years" and WorkCover knew their obligations.

The letter from Workcover to Cardcall breaching the court orders is one no one can explain. They all knew about it. I raised in court that the court orders had

been breached and tendered the letter as part of an affidavit. Cambridge said there was no evidence. Cambridge knew but did not care at that stage because he knew it was his job to cover it up. His initial interim orders were to cover himself but someone obviously had gotten to him and told him he needed to sweep this under the carpet as a lot of people could be gone. Then there is the money that the Labor Party was stealing from WorkCover that might of dried up if ICAC had kept looking at WorkCover. ([Click here to read](#))

Second Hearing Day

6th September 2005 - There were 3 witnesses but it started with the barrister Tristan Bors who was representing Cardcall saying the below

COMMISSIONER: I think we're up to the respondent's evidentiary case, are we not?

BORS: We are. I believe on the last occasion Mr Dowling closed just before we finished. **In the interim there were some orders made by the Commission. Those have been complied with and I have some documents, evidencing compliance.** Would the Commission care to take them or is that sufficient from the Bar table?

COMMISSIONER: If you tell me they've been complied with, that's sufficient for me.

Well they had not been complied with and Tristan Bors knew it and Cambridge should have asked to see the evidence. The three witnesses that day were 1. Russell Shields – General Manager for Cardcall 2. Ms Gabrielle Badman who claimed to be the Employee Relations Manager for Cardcall. She was actually the payroll manager but that is another story. 3. Jonathon Hassett of Hassett Dixon Lawyers who perjured himself like there was no tomorrow. The problem Hassett had is that he had written his statutory declaration saying the flags were safe and filed it with the court before Cambridge had issued his interim orders.

Transcript – 6th September 2005 ([Click here to read](#))

It was about November when WorkCover rang me and said that they were going to do nothing about my complaint in relation to Cardcall. I asked for written reasons and they said they do not give written reasons. I argued with the person and they eventually told me that I could file a Freedom of Information application for the file, which I did.

The matter was set down for closing arguments but I filed further evidence that I had obtained from the WorkCover file and requested that further evidence be allowed and that some of the witnesses be brought back for further questioning. That was heard on the 1st February 2006. Cambridge handed down his judgement that day and dismissed my case.

The judgement is legendary for how little it says. A clear tactic to allow him to lie later if need be. He makes two key points, neither stack up against the evidence.

1. He says at section 7 *"The actions of the applicant in sending the e-mail to customers, represented an act of gross misconduct which, in the circumstances of this case, **can not be justified by any associated, legitimate, occupational health and safety complaint.**"* Then why did Cambridge direct the company to warn people of the danger in his interim orders.

and at 8 *"Rather than protect the health and safety of others, the applicant's actions only served to deflect attention away from the elevated concentrations of solvents in the promotional flags and focus upon his misconduct instead. The simple, logical alternative would have been to make a documentary report to the appropriate agencies so as to hasten a comprehensive analysis of the solvent in flag issue."* I had the flags tested out of my own pocket and gave it to WorkCover. What more could I do. And WorkCover did nothing. So I was right to warn people.'

and at 6 *"The applicant had knowledge of and access to other proper channels for raising occupational health and safety concerns. Indeed the employer invited the applicant to pursue his occupational health and safety complaint with the relevant government authorities. The Statement and Interim Orders of this Commission as issued in this matter on 25 August 2005, would have been unnecessary had the applicant devoted his energies to constructing a documentary report to, inter alia, Workcover New South Wales, rather than the e-mail that he understood would precipitate his dismissal"* Well the company wanted me to go to WorkCover and take their chances there because they did not have workers compensation insurance which Cambridge knew. Cambridge also knew that WorkCover were in receipt of my complaint over three months before he issued his interim orders. So to blame me is a joke. For the final judgement ([Click here to read](#))

There is a lot more to this story than the above. But the bottom line is when someone takes a bribe to cover a crime like Ian Cambridge did in 1996 they are criminals. And once they commit a crime there is a good chance they will again like Cambridge has in the above post. There is plenty more evidence than what I have outlined above. But the above is extremely powerful by itself as there are too many questions that have no legitimate answers to them.

I will write another one or two posts as I took it further to ICAC and the government and up through WorkCover. More fun times.

So what's with the title of this post? It was in 2006 that I started investigating Ian Cambridge. That led me to news articles and Hansard on the Victorian Parliament website which spoke about Ian Cambridge and the AWU fraud which also involved Julia Gillard. From there I kept on following both of them. In 2007 Glenn Milne wrote his articles on the story including the infamous article where Julia Gillard said "I was young and Naive".

But she also complained in the article. *"I was obviously hurt when I was later falsely accused publicly of wrongdoing. I didn't do anything wrong and to have false allegations in the media was distressing."* But in November 2010 she falsely accused Julian Assange of breaking the law. It clicked with straight away her hypocrisy. At that stage I did not have this blog to write about it. In August 2011 I eventually wrote about it when this site had been up just over 7 months. ([Click here to read the post](#))

From there other media picked up on it and it has been an up and down ride since. But it is gathering pace now again. Cambridge wrote to then federal Minister for Industrial Relations Laurie Brereton in 1996 asking for a Royal Commission into the AWU scandal. Well this may come true, but it is his corruption outlined above that will be the catalyst for it, not his letter to Brereton. Cambridge was not expecting a Royal Commission, all he was doing is improving his negotiating position for a bribe which he eventually took. He would have been fully aware that a Labor government that is controlled by the unions was not going to have a royal commission into their own supporters.

If Cambridge and myself had never crossed paths Gillard would probably not have the problem she has now and has had for the past 14 months since I wrote that post.

I did my apprenticeship in judicial corruption with Ian Cambridge as my lecturer. This site is not motivated by him or the above but would certainly not be here without his teachings in the lessons above. So every supporter of this site should thank Ian Cambridge for being the criminal he is.

I have been waiting to until the time is right and until I have time to write this post. Anyone who has a copy of my book can go to page 167 and it says *"Mention the name Ian Cambridge to Julie Gillard and watch her choke. Who is Ian Cambridge you ask? He is Julie*

Gillard's very own personal Grim Reaper." The book was published in 2009 and that would have passed over the head of most people but plenty from the political fraternity would have known exactly what I meant.

The time is right now as some are painting Ian Cambridge as a hero for what he did in 1996. Well he is no hero. He is a criminal who took a bribe in 1996 and shut his mouth to conceal a crime and he has continued on his criminal path since as the above shows.

Admin: If everyone who came on this site made a \$30 pledge to the crowdfunding campaign that I am running it would meet its target in a day or two. The target is \$60,000 and has 15 days to go. It currently sits at \$2910 with 42 supporters. What the money would allow me to do is work on this site full-time for a year and take this site to the next level. Currently I work full-time and work on this site in my spare-time.

I believe what I do is in the public interest and well worth supporting.

The crowd funding campaign has to hit its target or it does not proceed. The faster it grows the more likely of success.

[Click here for more details or to make a pledge.](#)

If you have any questions please email me at: shanedowling at hotmail dot com

And make sure you follow this site by email which is on the top right of this page and about once a week you will get an email when there is a new post/story on this site.

It would be greatly appreciated if you spend a minute using Twitter, Facebook and email etc and promote this post. Just click on the icons below.

Thank you for your support.

<http://kangarocourtsofaustralia.com/2012/11/04/the-julia-gillard-ian-cambridge-and-shane-dowling-connection/>

From Adelaide Institute's Archive - 2009



Polly Peck

22 June, 2009 FREE

"I put it to you ..."

How laughable are the Libs? ... The toxic world of Senate Estimates ... The Feline's Friend stumbles as Utegate fails to skittle Wax or Wayne ... Then there was

Soapie Brandis' blustering cross-examination of the



HRC's Catherine Branson, which went precisely nowhere

"The Prime Minister and the Treasurer must resign."

That was the Feline's Friend, Opposition Leader M. Turnbull, puffed to the max with his *faux* indignation on Friday (June 19).

Today (Monday, June 22) the FF looked ashen as the Utegate affair looked like running him over.

But not as ashen as his backbench, who knew this one was a hopeless mission as their leader became more florid as he "raised concerns" in the House about Wayne's relationship with an Ipswich car dealer.

It turned out to be yet another instance of Turnbullian overreach – something for which he is infamous.

A classic instance in point was the defamation case he commenced on behalf of Kerry Packer against Frank Costigan's counsel assisting, Doug Meagher, over the leak of the Goanna stories.

In 1984 Turnbull thrust himself into the media just before the trial saying he had "significant evidence" that Meagher leaked the Goanna stuff to *The National Times*.

Ultimately, it was clear that not only did no "significant evidence" exist, no insignificant evidence existed and Meagher succeeded in having Packer's action struck out.

In the process, Justice David Hunt famously remarked that Turnbull's untrue statements had "managed effectively to poison the fountain of justice immediately before the commencement of the present proceedings". St James' Ethics Centre's [Simon Longstaff has penned a useful little guide](#) to the ethical dimensions of the imbroglio involving Rudd, the old ute, John Grant, OzCar representations and statements to parliament.

* * *

While Godless Wretch from Treasury was stealing all the Senate estimates limelight last week, we should not overlook the most recent posturing by the Senate's Legal and Constitutional Affairs committee.

It was the venue for Senators (Soapie) Brandis, (Guys'n'Dolls) Barnett and (Wild Bill) Hefferlump to whip themselves into lathers of righteous indignation.

Catherine Branson QC (seen here), President of the Australian Human Rights Commission came face to face with Soapie and Dolly.

Soap was highly cranky that the HRC had attended the UN Durban Review Conference on Racism in an observer capacity.

Branson explained:

It [the Human Rights Commission] was there with 38 other national human rights institutions, at least two of which were also there despite the fact that their governments were not parties. I regarded as entirely separate the questions of whether Australia should attend the conference represented as a nation and whether its national human rights institution should be an observer at the conference.

Brandis: You do not think you are being a bit too much of a lawyer about this, do you? What you say is of course from a legal point of view. Technically, it is absolutely right; but surely you appreciate that there were public policy issues, issues of community standards and issues of community expectations concerning Australia's participation in Durban II that transcend merely the technical character of your agency's attendance at this conference?



Branson: I did not understand that.

Brandis: You did not. If I may say so, with respect, you ought to have done... I understand and support the proposition that the Human Rights Commission should have a degree of independence from government and that it should be able to maintain a view which is not necessarily the view of the government of the day in relation to issues within its statutory charter. But do you not see that where one is dealing with an international conference the situation is a little different from that?...You give the impression to other participants that Australia in fact does support the process.

Branson: I am not sure how to answer that additionally to how I have already done so. You may be aware that our decision to participate followed a discussion among national human rights institutions which took place in Nairobi in October 2008.

Brandis: What about discussions of the elected representatives of the Australian people on both sides of politics that took place in this building throughout the early months of 2009?

Branson: As I understood it those discussions concerned whether the Australian nation would be represented through its government. The Australian Human Rights Commission went to what we saw as an important international conference dealing with racism, xenophobia and related intolerance, which we see as very important issues not only internationally but also in this country.

Brandis: Applauding anti-Semitism.

Branson: I beg your pardon?

Brandis: That conference was applauding anti-Semitism.

Branson: Could you draw my attention to the record of the conference that so does that?

Brandis: The communiqué from Durban I.

Branson: Can you draw my attention to the paragraph?



Brandis: Yes I am able to.

Branson: I have read carefully the review and in particular the outcomes document from the more recent review. Each of them deplores anti-Semitism. They stress that the Holocaust is not to be forgotten and ...

Brandis: Well, thank goodness for that, Ms Branson! The Holocaust is not to be forgotten. Thank goodness.

Chair: Senator Brandis, just let Ms Branson answer her question and then make some comments.

Branson: I think the outcomes document from the Durban review does not mention the Middle East at all, but does deplore anti-Semitism and Islamophobia.

Brandis: I put it to you that, by its decision ensuring that Australia was represented at the Durban II conference through the relevant human rights agency – yours – entirely in the face of a decision of the Australian government that Australia was not to be represented at the Durban II conference, the Australian Human Rights Commission showed utter contempt for the Australian government and had no regard whatsoever to the appropriate conduct of Australia's foreign policy.

Branson: I do not accept that that is the case.

Brandis: You obviously do not but I invite you to reflect carefully on it.

[snip]

Senator Barnett: And it did not occur to you at the time to reconsider your position as a commission?

Branson: Not seriously, no.

Barnett: When you say "not seriously", what does that mean?

Branson: I cannot rule out the possibility –

Barnett: Wouldn't you take the views of the Australian government and Minister for Foreign Affairs seriously?

Branson: I regarded them as entirely separate questions – whether the government should be a party to the conference or whether we should be there in an observer status.

Barnett: Surely you would show some respect – I will not say for your masters – for the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the government and the entity which funds your organisation.

Branson: I hope at all times that I treat the government with great respect. It is my intention to do so.

Barnett: They expressed a view that they wished to boycott the conference in the terms described by Senator Brandis and in the terms set out in the media release by Mr Smith.

Branson: I did not understand it as reaching to the Australian Human Rights Commission.

Brandis: Ms Branson! Who do you think you were representing at this conference?

Branson: We were not represented at the conference; we observed at the conference.

Brandis: On whose behalf were you observing?

Branson: We were observing on our own behalf as one of 38 national human rights institutions present in Geneva.

Brandis: It is more than implicit, it seems to me, in what you have to say that your attitude was that you were not representing or observing on behalf of Australia.

Branson: That was my view.

Brandis: So who were you representing?

Branson: I was representing the Australian Human Rights Commission.

Brandis: You were representing yourselves?

Branson: Yes.

Brandis: But you are an Australian government, Australian taxpayer funded agency. The view of the entire parliament was supportive of the position at which the Australian government ultimately arrived that Australia, not the Australian government, in the words of Mr Smith's letter, should not be represented at this conference – and yet you went along at taxpayer's expense to represent who? Yourself. Is that satisfactory?

Branson: I regard it as so. I understood the minister to be speaking about Australia the nation.

Brandis: So you were not representing Australia?

Branson: No.

<http://justinianarchive.com/1575-article#top>

Libs' "balanced" approach on human rights

Liberals' uncomfortable straddle on human rights ...

They are for HR, as long as the Human Rights Commission advocates against a Charter of Rights.

As if attending the Durban 11 gabfest was not enough of an insult for all Australians, Liberal Senators Guy (Dolly) Barnett and George (Soapy) Brandis are incandescent with fury that the Australian Human Rights Commission is an advocate for a *Human Rights Act*.

In another instalment of the recent estimates hearings by the Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, the two Liberals had more bones to pick with Catherine Branson

*

Branson: Yes. I accept that there are many people like you, Senator, who oppose a human rights act for Australia.

Barnett: Do you think there is merit in your commission having a more balanced approach? Can you see that there would be merit in you actually preparing both sides of the argument?

Branson: I have not noticed any absence of argument being advanced in opposition to an Australian Human Rights Act. It does not seem to me that the commission is needed to balance the argument. We are charged with protecting and promoting human rights in Australia, and it is our judgment that this would be a very positive measure.

Barnett: With the greatest respect, do you think that I have a view that is not similar to yours with respect to the importance of protecting and promoting human rights?

Branson: Not at all.

Barnett: Indeed, in my view, all those participating in the debate want that as an outcome. I would say, as has been said before, that the road to hell is often paved with good intentions. We all have good intentions here, but which way are we going, which route are we going to take? I think we are all on the same page in getting good outcomes in terms of human rights; it is just that I think that Australia has an exemplary record. Sure it can always be improved but, around the globe, I think it is a good record. Nevertheless, we have a taxpayer funded entity, as in your commission, promoting just one side of the coin. Frankly, I feel that is unbalanced and unfair.

Chair: Senator Barnett, do you have a question; rather than a lecture?

Barnett: I am asking for a response from Ms Branson.

Chair: The Human Rights Commission has been pretty much lectured at for nearly three-and-a-

half hours hours now, so I am wondering if you have a question.

Barnett: Chair, with the greatest respect, it is nearly 12.30 and I think that interjection from you was uncalled for.

Chair: That may well be your opinion. Do you have a question, Senator Barnett?



Barnett: Ms Branson, I will ask the question again: do you think there is merit in you preparing a view that could cover both sides of the argument?

Branson: No, Senator. The judgment of the commission is that the best way to advance the protection of human rights in Australia at the moment is by the enactment of a human rights act for Australia. That is the view that we are advocating and it will be at the heart of our submission to the national consultation ...

Senator Brandis: To say that the best way of doing that is through a charter is a controversial proposition among human rights advocates themselves and for the Human Rights Commission – whose statutory charter is to advance the cause of human rights – to advance particular mechanisms for human rights protection over other mechanisms of human right protection is – as Senator Barnett has suggested – not only to look at one side of the argument only but in fact a conceit.

Branson: A conceit? We have not ...

Brandis: It treats without respect the views of the human rights advocates who favour other mechanisms ...

Branson: I am aware, as I am sure the senators are aware, that there is a very wide range of views held by academics. Very many prominent academics and other lawyers support a human rights act for Australia. The commission regarded itself as entitled – and indeed, obliged – to make a judgment as to the appropriate course for it to take during the national consultation. We have adopted that course which we believe to be in the interests of the protection and promotion of the human rights of everyone in Australia.

Brandis: That is a political opinion. In a [submission to the National Human Rights Consultation](#) the Opposition rejects a Charter of Rights. Instead, it proposes that a parliamentary

committee be given human rights oversight of federal legislation. For good measure there should be a "human rights audit" of Commonwealth laws – done by politicians. That should fix everything.

Barnett: Ms Branson, I will ask the question again: do you think there is merit in you preparing a view that could cover both sides of the argument?

Branson: No, Senator. The judgment of the commission is that the best way to advance the protection of human rights in Australia at the moment is by the enactment of a human rights act for Australia. That is the view that we are advocating and it will be at the heart of our submission to the national consultation...

Senator Brandis: To say that the best way of doing that is through a charter is a controversial proposition among human rights advocates themselves and for the Human Rights Commission – whose statutory charter is to advance the cause of human rights – to advance particular mechanisms for human rights protection over other mechanisms of human right protection is – as Senator Barnett has suggested – not only to look at one side of the argument only but in fact a conceit.

Branson: A conceit? We have not ...

Brandis: It treats without respect the views of the human rights advocates who favour other mechanisms...

Branson: I am aware, as I am sure the senators are aware, that there is a very wide range of views held by academics. Very many prominent academics and other lawyers support a human rights act for Australia. The commission regarded itself as entitled – and indeed, obliged – to make a judgment as to the appropriate course for it to take during the national consultation. We have adopted that course which we believe to be in the interests of the protection and promotion of the human rights of everyone in Australia.

Brandis: That is a political opinion. In a [submission to the National Human Rights Consultation](#) the Opposition rejects a Charter of Rights. Instead, it proposes that a parliamentary committee be given human rights oversight of federal legislation. For good measure there should be a "human rights audit" of Commonwealth laws – done by politicians. That should fix everything.

<http://justinianarchive.com/1576-article>

AI comments:

BENDING TO JEWISH PRESSURE

Politician Brandis represents the interests of global Jewry/Holocaust-Shoah myths, while Branson does not give Holocaust-Shoah skeptics the benefit of doubt, and in her Human Rights model TRUTH as a guiding principle/ideal does not exist. She is a prime example of a non-Jew bending to Jewish pressure, thereby revealing her own moral and intellectual bankruptcy.

See Branson's 2001 judgment as FCA judge in *Jones v Töben*, which she based on Kath McEvoy's perversely reasoned decision as commissioner for HREOC -re-branded as Human Rights Commission.

The perversion contained in the RDA s18c is that there is an attempt legally to protect individuals from experiencing 'hurt feelings', especially those generated by content that is racial and sexist.

So-called 'Holocaust denial', which correctly termed is Holocaust Revisionism, is deemed to be such an act because it is 'antisemitic' in nature!

[Jones v Toben \(includes explanatory memorandum\) \[2002\] FCA 1150 \(17 September 2002\)](#)

[Jones v Toben \[2000\] HREOCA 39 \(5 October 2000\)](#)

*

It must be remembered that when the Soviet Union was founded in 1917, the first concepts criminalised was 'antisemite' and punished with death, and 'revisionist' with banishment to the Gulags.

*

Another explanatory note: Currently it is fashionable to equate Zionism with Nazism. This is a result of a fundamental conceptual error by those who believe both political movements were nationalistic; the former for the Jews and the latter for the Germans.

The German National Socialist model disconnected from anything Jew-inspired, for example, kosher slaughter was banned, and circumcision was banned, which is a fundamental of Judaism's belief system and its various forms of expression, whether it is Zionism, Torah-True Jews, et al.

Interpreting the world through Jewish eyes

*

'Superman' Creator's Heirs Lose Suit to Comics Giant
DC Comics Wins Superhero's Rights Over Joe Shuster
By [JTA](#) Published October 18, 2012.



getty images

The heirs of Superman co-creator Joe Shuster do not have the right to reclaim copyrights to the popular character, a federal judge ruled. Wednesday's ruling gives DC Comics, owned by Warner Bros., all rights to Superman for books, movies, television and other medium.

In response to a DC Comics lawsuit filed in 2010 seeking a judgment that it owns all copyrights to the Man of Steel, U.S. District Court Judge Otis D. Wright ruled that Schuster's sister and her son did not succeed in reclaiming their rights to Superman. The judge decided that a 1992 agreement to receive annual payments from DC Comics in exchange for all rights to the character made by Shuster's sister superseded the Shuster heirs' claim under "termination rights" in U.S. copyright law.

The estate of co-creator Jerry Siegel successfully reclaimed some rights to Superman using such a termination notice some four years ago.

Warner Bros. likely filed the lawsuit against the Shuster heirs because it is in the middle of production of a new Superman movie, "Man of Steel," scheduled to be released next summer.

<http://forward.com/articles/164505/superman-creators-heirs-lose-suit-to-comics-giant/#ixzz2BIghpV6t>

OPEN LETTER TO BISHOP FELLAY ON AN "EXCLUSION"

London, 19 October, 2012

Your Excellency,



BISHOP RICHARD NELSON WILLIAMSON

Thank you for your letter of October 4 in which, on behalf of the General Council and General Chapter, you let me know of your "recognisance", "declaration" and "decision" that I no longer belong to the Society of St Pius X. The reasons given for your decision to exclude your servant are, you tell me, the following: he has continued to publish the "Eleison Comments"; he has attacked the authorities of the Society; he has exercised an independent apostolate; he has given support to rebellious colleagues; he has been formally, obstinately and pertinaciously disobedient; he has separated himself from the Society; he no longer submits to any authority.

May not all these reasons be summed up in disobedience? No doubt in the course of the last 12 years your servant has said and done things which before God were inappropriate and excessive, but I think it would be enough to point them out one by one for him to make the apology called for in all truth and justice. But we are no doubt agreed that the essential problem is not to be found in these details, that it can be summed up in one word: disobedience.

Then let us at once point out how many more or less disagreeable orders of the Superior General have been unfailingly obeyed by your servant. In 2003 he left behind an important and fruitful apostolate in the United States to go to Argentina. In 2009 he left his post as Seminary Rector and left behind Argentina to moulder in a London attic for three and a half years, with no episcopal functions because they were denied him. All that was left to him by way of ministry was virtually the weekly "Eleison Comments", the refusal to interrupt which constitutes the large part of the "disobedience" of which he stands accused. And ever since 2009 it has been open season for the Society Superiors to discredit and insult him to their hearts' content, and Society members all over the world have been encouraged by their example to do the same if they wished. Your servant hardly reacted, preferring silence to scandalous confrontations. One might go so far as to say that he obstinately refused to disobey. But let that go, because that is not the real problem.

Then where is the real problem to be found? By way of reply let the accused be allowed to give a rapid overview of the history of the Society from which he is supposedly separating himself. For indeed the central problem goes a long way back. Starting with the French Revolution towards the end of the 18th century, in many a formerly Christian State a New World Order began to establish itself, thought up by the Church's enemies to chase God out of his own creation. To begin with, the old order in which throne upheld altar was replaced by the

separation of Church and State. As a result, society was structured in a radically different way, creating serious difficulties for the Church, because the State, being henceforth implicitly godless, was bound in the end to fight the religion of God with all its might. Sure enough, the Freemasons set about replacing the true worship of God with the worship of liberty, a worship of which the neutral State in matters of religion is merely an instrument. Thus began in modern times a relentless war between the religion of God, defended by the Catholic Church, and the religion of man, liberated from God, and liberal. The two religions are as irreconcilable as God and the Devil. A choice has to be made between Catholicism and liberalism.

But man wants to have his cake and eat it. He does not want to have to choose. He wants it both ways. So in the wake of the French Revolution Félicité Lamennais invented liberal Catholicism, and from that moment on, the reconciling of things irreconcilable became common currency within the Church. For 120 years God in his mercy gave to his Church a series of Popes, from Gregory XVI to Pius XII, who for the most part saw clear and held firm, but an ever growing number of lay folk were inclining towards independence from God and towards the material pleasures which liberal Catholicism makes much more accessible. The corruption spread until it infected bishops and priests, at which point God finally allowed them to choose the kind of Popes they preferred, namely Popes who would pretend to be Catholic but would in fact be liberals, whose talk might be right-wing but whose action is left-wing, who are characterized by their contradictions, ambiguity, Hegelian dialectic, in brief, by their lies. We are into the New church of Vatican II.

It was bound to be. Only a dreamer can reconcile things in reality irreconcilable. Yet God, as St Augustine says, does not abandon souls that do not first want to abandon him, and so he comes to the aid of the small remnant of souls that is unwilling to join in the soft apostasy of Vatican II. He raises an Archbishop to resist the betrayal of the Conciliar churchmen. Respecting reality, with no desire to reconcile things irreconcilable, refusing to dream, this Archbishop speaks with a clarity, a coherence and truth that enables the sheep to recognize the voice of the divine Master. The priestly Society which he founds to form true Catholic priests begins on a small scale, but by its resolute refusal of the Conciliar errors and of their basis in liberal Catholicism, it draws to itself a remainder of true Catholics all over the world, and it constitutes the backbone of a whole movement within the Church which will go under the name of Traditionalism.

But this movement is intolerable to the churchmen of the New church who mean to replace Catholicism with liberal Catholicism. Backed by the media and State governments, they do everything they can to discredit, disgrace and ostracize the courageous Archbishop. In 1976 Paul VI suspends him "a divinis", in 1988 John-Paul II "excommunicates" him. He is a supreme nuisance to the Conciliar Popes because his voice of truth has the effect of showing up their pack of lies and of imperilling the betrayal they mean to carry out. And despite being persecuted, despite even being "excommunicated", he holds firm, as do the large number of the priests of his Society.

Such faithfulness to the truth obtains from God a dozen years of internal peace and external prosperity for the Society. In

1991 the great Archbishop dies, but for another nine years his work carries on, faithful to the anti-liberal principles on which it was built. So what will the Conciliar Romans do to bring the resistance to an end? They will exchange the stick for the carrot.

In 2000 a major Jubilee Year pilgrimage of the Society to Rome shows forth in the basilicas and streets of Rome the power of the Society. The Romans are impressed, despite themselves. A Cardinal invites the four Society bishops to a sumptuous luncheon in his apartment. Three of them accept. Immediately after this most brotherly encounter, contacts between Rome and the Society which had grown rather cold over the last 12 years, pick up again, and with them begins a powerful process of seduction, as one might say, by means of scarlet buttons and marble halls.

Indeed contacts warm up again so swiftly that by the end of the year many priests and laity of Tradition are already afraid of a reconciliation taking place between Catholic Tradition and the liberal Council. The reconciliation does not come about for the moment, but the language of Society headquarters in Menzingen is beginning to change, and over the 12 years to come, it will show itself ever less hostile to Rome and ever more open to the New church, to its media and their world. And while at the top of the Society the way is being paved for the reconciliation of irreconcilables, so amongst the priests and laity the attitude towards the Conciliar Popes and Church, towards everything worldly and liberal, is becoming more and more favourable. After all, is the modern world that surrounds us really as bad as it is made out to be?

This advance of liberalism within the Society, noticed by a minority of priests and laity but apparently not noticed by the great majority, became evident to many more in the spring of this year when, following on the failure in the spring of 2011 of the Doctrinal Discussions to bring the doctrines of Tradition and the Council together, the Society's Catholic policy up till then of "No practical agreement without a doctrinal agreement" changed overnight into the liberal policy of "No doctrinal agreement, therefore a practical agreement". And in mid-April the Superior General offered to Rome, as basis for a practical agreement, an ambiguous text, openly favourable to the "hermeneutic of continuity" which is Benedict XVI's favourite recipe to reconcile, precisely, the Council with Tradition! "We need a new way of thinking," the Superior General said in May to a meeting of priests of the Society's Austrian District. In other words, the leader of the Society founded in 1970 to resist the novelties of the Council, was proposing to reconcile it with the Council. Today the Society is conciliatory. Tomorrow it is to be fully Conciliar!

It is difficult to believe that Archbishop Lefebvre's foundation can have been led to bracket out the principles on which it was founded, but such is the seductive power of the fantasies of our godless world, modernist and liberal. Notwithstanding, reality does not give way to fantasies, and it forms part of reality that one cannot undo the principles of a founder without undoing his foundation. A founder has special graces that none of his successors have. As Padre Pio cried out when the Superiors of his Congregation were starting to "renew" his Congregation in accordance with the new way of thinking of the Council, just closed: "What are you doing with the Founder?" The Society's Superior General, General Council and General Chapter may keep Archbishop Lefebvre on hand as a mascot, but that will not help if they all share in a new way of thinking that by-passes the crucial reasons for which he founded the Society. Therefore however good their intentions,

they are leading the Society to its ruin by a betrayal parallel in all respects to that of Vatican II.

But let us be just, let us not exaggerate. Since the beginning of this slow collapse of the Society, there have always been priests and laity who saw clear and did their best to resist. In the spring of this year their resistance became more weighty and numerous, so that the General Chapter of last July did place an obstacle in the way of a false Rome-SSPX agreement. But will that obstacle hold up? One may fear not. In front of some 40 Society priests on retreat in Écône in September, the Superior General, referring to his policy with regard to Rome, admitted: "I was wrong," but whose fault was it? – "The Romans deceived me." Likewise from the whole springtime crisis he said that there had arisen "a great distrust within the Society" which would need to be healed "by acts and not just by words", but whose fault was it? Judging by his acts since September, which includes this letter of October 4, he is blaming the priests and laity who failed to put their trust in him as their leader. After the Chapter as before, it seems as though he can brook no opposition to his conciliatory and Conciliar policy.

And that is the real reason why the Superior General has given several times the formal order to close down "Eleison Comments". Indeed the "Comments" have repeatedly criticized the Society authorities' conciliatory policy towards Rome, thereby attacking them implicitly. Now if in this criticism and these attacks there has sometimes been a failure to observe the respect normally due to the office or persons of the Society authorities, I readily beg forgiveness of anyone concerned, but I think that anybody actually reading the particular "Comments" implicated will recognize that the criticism and attacks usually abstracted from the persons, because the issues at stake are far more than just personal.

And if we do come to the great problem far surpassing mere persons, let us call to mind the immense confusion presently reigning in the Church, and placing in peril the eternal salvation of souls without number.

Is it not the duty of a bishop to uncover the true roots of this confusion and to denounce them in public? How many bishops in the whole wide world see clear as Archbishop Lefebvre saw clear, and how many are teaching accordingly? How many of them are still teaching Catholic doctrine at all? Surely very few. Then is now the moment to be trying to silence a bishop who is doing so, if one is to judge by the number of souls that hang on to the "Comments" as they would to a lifebelt? How in particular can another bishop be wanting to shut them down when he himself has just had to admit to his priests that he let himself be deceived for many a long year on the same great questions?

Likewise, if the rebellious bishop took upon himself – for the first time in nigh on four years – an independent apostolate, how can he be blamed for having accepted an invitation, coming from outside the Society, to give the sacrament of Confirmation and to preach the word of truth? Is that not the very function of a bishop? And if he is accused of having preached what was a word of "confusion", there is always the same answer: what he said in Brazil was confusing only for people who follow the line confessed to be an error, as evoked above.

So if he does seem for years to have been separating himself from the Society, the truth is that he has been distancing himself from the conciliatory Society, and not from that of the Archbishop. And if he seems insubordinate to any exercise of authority on the part of Society leaders, the truth is that that applies only to orders running counter to the purposes for

which the Society was founded. In fact how many other orders are there at all, besides the order to close down the "Comments", which he can be blamed for having disobeyed in a "formal, obstinate and pertinacious" manner? Is there even one other such order? Since Archbishop Lefebvre refused to obey only acts of authority of Church leaders which were of a nature to destroy the Church, his disobedience was more apparent than real. Likewise refusing to close down the "Comments" is a disobedience more apparent than real.

For indeed history repeats itself, and the Devil keeps coming back. Just as yesterday Vatican II wished to reconcile the Catholic Church with the modern world, so today one could say that Benedict XVI and the Society's Superior General both wish to reconcile Catholic Tradition and the Council; so again tomorrow, unless God intervenes between now and then, the leaders of the Catholic Resistance will be trying to reconcile it with Tradition henceforth Conciliar.

In brief, your Excellency, you may now go ahead and exclude me, because the arguments above are not likely to persuade you, but the exclusion will be more apparent than real. I have been a member of the Archbishop's Society ever since my perpetual engagement. I have been one of its priests for 36 years. I have been one of its bishops, like yourself, for nearly

a quarter of a century. That is not all to be wiped out with one stroke of a pen. Member of the Archbishop's Society I therefore remain, and I wait.

Had you remained faithful to the Archbishop's heritage, and had I myself been notably unfaithful, gladly I would recognize your right to exclude me. But things being as they are, I hope I shall not be lacking in the respect due to your office if I suggest that for the glory of God, for the salvation of souls, for the internal peace of the Society and for your own eternal salvation, you would do better yourself to resign as Superior General than to exclude myself. May the good Lord give you the grace, the light and the strength to perform such an outstanding act of humility and of devotion to the common good of everybody.

And so, as I have so often finished the letters I have written to you over the years,

Dominus tecum, may the Lord be with you.

+Richard Williamson.

About Jean-Claude Pressac's capitulation

R. Faurisson to Monsignor Williamson

– On Fri, Nov 2, 2012 at 5:29 PM, Jean Norton <celine.norton67@gmail.com> wrote:

Monsignor,

My friend Michael Hoffman writes: "*Krah claims that Williamson was given Pressac's report on the alleged homicidal gas chambers to study 'for a year' but he 'failed' to do so*".

Is this true? It would be piquant to note that you were given a book to read in which Pressac, in 1989, still put forward an argument that he was to repudiate six years later, on June 15, 1995, to be precise, writing that it was good only for "the rubbish bins of history" (as revealed five years afterwards by Valérie Igounet in her *Histoire du négationnisme en France*, Paris, Seuil, 2000, p. 652).

I should not like to speak of this with M. Hoffman without knowing beforehand whether this Krah is telling the truth.

I hope that you are holding out in the storm. Your opponents, in any case, will have disgraced themselves for nought.

Yours respectfully, RF

2. Reply of Mgr Williamson to RF:

Dear Professor,

I read about two-fifths of Pressac's magnum opus, and could not be bothered to read any more. Michael Hoffman's article is basically accurate. I did at the time study several works on the "Holocaust", for instance by Germar Rudolf, and you may remember I was soon resorting to yourself for guidance. I had grasped that you were the "doyen" of "Revisionists", and -- pardon me -- the most reliable. Even now I beg you to stay with us, as you also know! I hope there will be no nasty sequels of your hospitalization.

Do not worry about my expulsion from the SSPX. The parallels with Vatican II are unending. For instance Mgr Lefebvre said at his own "excommunication"; "They cannot throw me out of the Conciliar Church because I never belonged to it."

He was a very great man, but the neo-SSPX spurns him, except as a mascot.

Let me know if you need any more information.

All good wishes, and blessings, Mgr W.

3. Note of thanks from RF to Mgr Williamson:

Thank you indeed, Monsignor, for the detailed answer. It seems to me that whenever we write Pressac's name we should recall his capitulation of June 15, 1995, a result of the public humiliation that I dealt him in the seventeenth chamber of the Paris Criminal Court, through the intermediary of barrister Eric Delcroix, on May 9 of the same year. Those present in the courtroom could note the poor wretch's utter inability to show, describe, or explain the "magic gas chambers" of Auschwitz for us. As for me, seated where I was at the foot of the judges' dais, I did not let him escape my gaze and so saw the tears well up in his eyes when, arms raised towards the sky, he said to presiding judge Martine Ract-Madoux: "Madam, you must understand: I'm alone in my struggle." The revisionists should make it their duty to redress their long silence on this spectacular victory and on the fact that the exterminationists, at their end, kept this capitulation hidden for five years.

In my trophy room for the biggest peddlers of one of history's greatest lies, I have PUBLICLY mounted, with the help of two lawyers (Doug Christie and Eric Delcroix), the heads of Léon Poliakov, Raul Hilberg, Rudolf Vrba, Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Georges Wellers, Jean-Claude Pressac, Robert Badinter and a few other lesser individuals.

Do forgive me these reminders. The hour of reckoning is approaching, alas, for me.

Yours respectfully, RF